



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



**CHAMP CLARK**



Copyright by HARRIS & EWING

OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD

# NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

NO. DCLXXIX

---

JUNE, 1912

---

## TWO DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATES

BY THE EDITOR

---

It is a significant and encouraging fact that two of the leading candidates for the Democratic nomination for President hail from the long-ostracized South—significant because of the total absence of invidious remark in the North and the West, encouraging as evidence of a country at last reunited in truth as well as in name. One is Speaker of the House of Representatives; the other is its leader. They personify, respectively, the old and the new schools of American statesmanship. Despite their long experience in the public service, they are necessarily less well known through the medium of their utterances than corresponding leaders of the party which has held direct authority and responsibility for so many years. Now, however, in view of the existing political condition, attention is riveted upon them. The sole purpose of the following presentation is to enable readers of the REVIEW to make acquaintance, not with their personalities, but with their minds.

---

CHAMP CLARK

CHAMP CLARK was born in Anderson County, Kentucky, on March 7, 1850. The community was one of pioneers whose days were long and full of toil. From dawn to dusk

Copyright, 1912, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved.

VOL. CXCIV.—NO. 679

46

man labored in forest and field and woman's work was never done. For boys and girls was little play. It was a struggle for existence in which all joined with the resolution and cheery optimism of a hardy race. From early necessities and fatiguing experience Champ Clark derived the intense sympathy with tillers of the soil, which continues to be the distinguishing trait of his guileless nature. From his father he inherited love for imaginative literature and picturesque expression; from his mother consciousness of reverence and faith in the justice and mercy of God. Isolated from humankind, he could live and die content if not deprived of the exaltation which such a spirit is able invariably to draw from the poetry of the Bible.

Champ Clark's early life was so typical of American development that it need not be depicted. Craving for knowledge dominated. Hence earnest application, first in the common schools, then in country college and State university, finally as teacher himself and president of a small college in West Virginia at twenty-three. Admitted to the bar at twenty-five in Bowling Green, Missouri, he became city attorney in 1878, began his political career as member of the State Assembly in 1889, was elected to Congress in 1893, achieved influence slowly but steadily until he was chosen to be, first, leader of the minority and, secondly, Speaker of the House by the unanimous voice of his party associates. It is with the development of his intellect and judgment, as indicated by his public utterances during the past twenty years, that we shall concern ourselves upon the eve of the Democratic National Convention, to which his name will be presented as that of one worthy to become a candidate for President of the United States.

Grover Cleveland was inaugurated the second time on March 4, 1893. On the same day Champ Clark began his long period of service as Representative in Congress. The Democratic party had carried the country upon two vital declarations:

"Republican protection is a fraud, a robbery of the great majority of the American people for the benefit of the few."

"We hold to the use of both gold and silver as the standard money of the country, and to the coinage of both gold and silver without discrimination against either metal."

Champ Clark was a zealot. His belief in the rightfulness of these two proposals was as strong as his faith in

the righteousness of his Maker. His first speech on the double standard, delivered on August 19, 1893, began as follows:

"MR. SPEAKER. To demonetize or not to demonetize silver is the question that now confronts us. We might as well recognize the truth and look it squarely in the face. There is no good to come of beating about the bush. There is no sense in whipping the devil around the stump.

"No subterfuge, no sophistry can delude the people on this momentous subject. The issue is squarely joined. There is, there can be, no misunderstanding about it. From utterances, public and private, here, from articles in current magazines and periodicals, we know that it is the remorseless purpose of a minority of this House to utterly destroy silver as a money metal, while a majority of us are determined to restore it to its place of ancient honor, usefulness, and beneficence in the coinage of the country. [Applause.]

"There can be no straddling, no dodging, no foraging between the lines, and no fence-riding in this fierce contest.

"Ha who is not with us is against us." [Applause.]

He set forth the familiar arguments in favor of bimetallism and continued:

"MR. SPEAKER. It is an old saying that all things are fair in love or war, and some people appear to believe that anything is fair in politics. I dissent *in toto* from any such immoral doctrine. The people have a right to honest treatment at the hands of those who aspire to be their agents in public affairs, and to the man who betrays them they will send the silken bowstring for his own destruction. [Loud applause.] It is my solemn conviction that the man who will deceive the people to obtain an office will desert them when in office.

"I reiterate the proposition—and it cannot be repeated too often—that the Chicago platform proclaimed to all the world that we are in favor of cutting the tariff to a strictly revenue basis, and in favor of bimetallism; and let me tell the single-gold-standard Democrats that if the people west of the Alleghanies had not believed that both of those things would come about there would now be no Democratic Congress to pass a money bill and no Democratic President to sign one. [Loud applause.] The people knew what they wanted, and they thought they knew what they were getting. [Laughter and applause.] Shall they have it, or shall they not?

"Will we redeem the solemn pledges made by tongue and pen to the people and be considered their benefactors forever, or will we violate our vows and have pronounced upon our heads their anathema maranatha? Will we restore happiness and prosperity to the land and read our history in the nation's eyes, or will we be the instruments in creating universal bankruptcy among the people who have committed to our hands a sacred trust?

"These questions I press home upon the mind, heart, and conscience of every Democrat upon this floor. . . .

"Now, the average American citizen may not be much of a political

economist or logician. He may not know a syllogism when he sees it, and cannot in technical terms distinguish a major premise from a minor; but nevertheless, in his own homely way, he reasons a great deal more than he gets credit for. He knows when he is hurt and when his business is crippled. [Applause.] He understands that when, after toiling sixteen hours a day through summer's heat and winter's cold, and after practising the severest economy, he cannot at the end of the year make buckle and tongue meet, there is something radically wrong and that 'something is rotten in the state of Denmark.' . . .

"The leaders in the cities express their opinions through the metropolitan press by resolutions of all sorts of boards and by pamphlets galore. The great body of the people, the wealth-creators, are not heard from in any such way; but as certain as God reigns in heaven they will discover a way to make their voice penetrate even to this Hall.

"Let the people eat grass!" quoth the pampered lackey of Louis XVI., who lost his head upon the block.

"The people be damned!" shouts William H. Vanderbilt, whose father laid the foundations of a more than princely fortune by selling root-beer at three cents per glass.

"Popular delusions!" exclaims the gentleman from Tennessee, whose sudden conversion eclipses that of Saul of Tarsus, as he journeyed down from Jerusalem to Damascus. [Laughter and applause.]

"Over against these ejaculations I would place for our instruction the words of the foremost man of all this world. On a celebrated occasion Queen Victoria thought to overawe William E. Gladstone by saying, 'Do you know who I am? I am the Queen of England!' To which the great Commoner answered, 'Madam, do you know who I am? I am the people of England!' [Applause.]

"No wonder he is universally known as the Grand Old Man."

He concluded sonorously:

"The great Irish orator, Charles Stewart Parnell, once said:

"Opportunity is a horse, saddled and bridled, which stops at each man's threshold once in a lifetime. Be ready, mount, and he carries you on to success and honor. Pause but a moment, he is gone, and the clatter of his iron hoofs, echoing down the corridors of time, will forever remind you of what you have lost."

"My Democratic brethren, the magnificent silver-white steed stands pawing impatiently at our gates. Let us vault into the saddle and ride him into the realm of unflinching prosperity, amid the benedictions of a grateful people."

Here spoke the orator of the plains, voicing the prejudice of country against city with extravagant expression and sophomoric peroration, but through the grandiloquent language rang the note of intense earnestness and uncompromising defiance in support of what the speaker believed to be the rights of the people.

With like vigor and in similar vein he made his first

speech on the tariff on January 15, 1894, extracts from which follow:

"I am in favor of the Wilson bill because it will render our laborers independent freemen and eager patrons of our merchants and our farmers, which God intended them to be, and not the ragged habitués of soup-houses, to which pitiable condition a protective tariff has reduced them.

"Tennyson says:

"Better fifty years of Europe  
Than a cycle of Cathay':

"And I say: Better for the American workman is steady employment at fair wages than all the charity which Andrew Carnegie could dispense from his Scottish castle in a thousand years. [Applause.]

"If the Wilson bill conferred no other boon upon the people of America than placing salt on the free list, that alone would be its ample vindication.

"God made salt an absolute necessity to animal life; consequently it is abundant in quantity and universal in diffusion. It is everywhere—held in solution in the ocean, lakes, and springs. It is mingled in every soil under heaven. It is found in solid and inexhaustible masses in Kansas, Nevada, and many other States and countries. It is scooped up by the ton on the seashore and on the banks of the Great Salt Lake of Utah—already prepared for the use of man and beast. It is pumped from the recesses of the earth and evaporated by the sun. It is quarried in great blocks like building-stone. God made it cheap and bountiful; the tariff barons make it scarce and dear. From time immemorial it has been the test of friendship and the pledge of hospitality. To taste an Arab's salt is to secure his protection forever. Among the ancients it was part of their sacrificial ceremonies. The New Testament Scriptures abound in allusions to it. Its importance has been recognized in all the literatures of the world. The Saviour of mankind gave it the seal of His divine approbation when He said to His disciples: 'Ye are the salt of the earth.'

"It should be as free as the air we breathe, but the greed of man has laid a heavy tax upon this purifier and preserver of things physical. This disgrace upon our civilization should be wiped from our statute-books instantan and without ceremony. It is not only a grave mistake from an economic standpoint, but is essentially wicked. Even a heathen emperor—Aurelian, one of the greatest of the Roman conquerors, glory to his name!—hundreds of years before Christopher Columbus set sail from Palos, had a nobler conception of humanity, and prohibited his soldiers from levying a tribute of salt upon any subjugated people.

"The pathway of civilization on this continent may be traced by the salt springs. Round about them clustered the earliest settlements in the wilderness. They constituted the mile-posts on the march of the all-conquering Caucasian from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

"The history of the Blue Licks and of Boone's Lick forms as romantic chapters as can be found in martial story. It was free salt which lured Daniel Boone and his comrades to those spots far beyond the outposts of civilization.



"Thomas H. Benton labored for a quarter of a century to place salt upon the free list, and when he had succeeded, in his exaltation of spirit he declared that he could hear the cattle on a thousand hills bellowing out their love and gratitude to him. [Laughter and applause.]

"Pass this bill and give the people a chance to earn an honest living. An idle brain is the devil's workshop.

"The ideal condition of affairs is not where there are a few very rich men and a great many very poor men, but where everybody can find work to do. [Applause.]

"Men with brains in their heads, the love of humanity in their souls, and the courage of their convictions in their hearts, will with eager hands rend the temple of protection till not one stone shall be left upon another in that robbers' castle. God speed the day!" [Applause.]

The Wilson bill was emasculated by the Senate, and in 1896 Bryan was defeated on the silver issue. He and his supporters insisted and believed that the election of McKinley was directly attributable to the use of an enormous corruption fund raised in the East by Mr. Hanna. The Far West and the Southwest were angry to the verge almost of insurrection. Cleveland was held responsible for what they considered a gross violation of their rights as citizens. Champ Clark returned to Washington in March, 1897, imbued with their wrath. The Dingley bill was brought forward for immediate consideration. On March 26th, while stinging with resentment, he engaged in a running debate, in the course of which, egged on by mischievous Republicans, he declared:

"Grover Cleveland is not a Democrat. [Laughter on the Republican side and applause on the Democratic side.] As a Democrat, bred and born, understanding its tenets, loving its traditions, ready always and everywhere to battle for its principles, I solemnly declare that he never was a Democrat.

"On the 4th of March, 1893, sustained by a people's love, he might have stood against the world; now, none so poor as to do him reverence.

"On the 6th of March, 1893, in his first official act, he startled all the Democrats in the land, and a great many Republicans, by appointing to the highest office within his gift a sore-head Republican. [Laughter.]

"According to his mugwumpish notions, he could not find within the confines of the Republic a Democrat fit to be Secretary of State.

"That was the beginning of the end, and from that day to this he has been the best friend the Republican party ever had—its most efficient ally. We repudiate him and all his works."

Five days later he added, bitterly:

"Mr. Chairman, after nine days of sore travail, at last one truth has been brought forth on the Republican side of this House, and that by

the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. Linney], when he said that I would destroy every custom-house in America. He is entirely correct. If I had my way to-day, sir, I would tear them all down, from turret to foundation-stone, for from the beginning they have been nothing but dens of robbers."

The passage of the bill under the whip and spur of Speaker Reed served only to enhance the rancor of the Western farmers at what they regarded as Cleveland's betrayal of both cause and pledge. On May 3, 1898, his throat choking with rage, Champ Clark spoke as follows:

"There are but two men in all the hoary registers of time that Cleveland's name ought to be associated with—Judas Iscariot and Benedict Arnold. Shades of Arnold, forgive the profanation!

"He at least did not hire a substitute to do his fighting. The blood which he shed at the storming of Quebec and on the heights of Saratoga was American blood. The shattered leg which was buried in his grave of obloquy was an American leg, broken by British bullets in the holy cause of liberty.

"Arnold was at one time both a hero and a patriot. He fell headlong from his high estate to everlasting infamy.

"Upon reflection, I think really I ought to beg the pardon of Judas Iscariot, because after his treason he did have the grace to go out and hang himself. [Laughter.] The Missourians did vote for Grover Cleveland in Chicago."

MR. CUMMINGS. "Was he not a Democrat then?"

MR. CLARK, of Missouri. "No. We thought he was; but we were sadly mistaken. He stole the livery of Heaven to serve the devil in. He played a colossal bunco game on the Democratic party. He was the tool of the plutocrats masquerading as a Democrat."

MR. MITCHELL. "Why did you vote for him, then?"

MR. CLARK, of Missouri. "I will tell you why we nominated him. We nominated him because he sent that free-trade message to Congress in 1887. We thought that Cleveland was honestly a free-trader."

"Now, Mr. Speaker, we voted for Cleveland on that ground. I am afraid we shall never get forgiveness for it. His conduct on the financial question is not the main charge that I bring against Cleveland, bad and un-Democratic as it was. We took him, knowing that he differed with us somewhat on the silver question, but we believed that as an honest man—because then we believed he was honest—if he accepted the nomination on that platform, knowing the overwhelming sentiment in the Democratic party in favor of silver, he would subordinate his private opinion to the general Democratic opinion and carry out what we wanted.

"That's what he should have done. Otherwise he ought to have declined the nomination. Men are not forced to be President. They are not compelled to hold office. At least I have not found it so in Missouri. But the main charge that I bring against him—and I have always been a free-trader—is this, that he not only undid us on the money question and used the patronage of his great office ruthlessly and corruptly to get the Sherman law repealed, because when we first met here in con-

ference we had a majority of this House against that repeal, but when we came to vote on it we could only muster a paltry 101 votes—the worst charge that will be laid at his door in the day of judgment is that he betrayed a great party on the tariff question.

“Yes. Grover Cleveland by his unfaithfulness did the cause of free trade more harm than all the McKinleys and Dingleys could do in one hundred years. He could not kill it. Nobody can do that; but he did set it back for perhaps a generation.

“The tariff barons ought to build a monument to his odoriferous memory.

“I believe now, and I shall always believe, that on the day when he stood in the sleet and snow and rain, the day when he was sworn in for his second term, he held it in his pudgy fist to keep the Democratic party in power in this country for a quarter of a century, and all that he had to do to work that beneficent result was to do what he had solemnly promised to do by word of mouth, by speech, in writing, in every way in which a man can be committed to do a thing—and that was to cut the robber tariff to a purely revenue basis. That was the issue on which we won the sweeping victory of 1892—a victory the fruits of which turned to apples of Sodom on our lips, through the action as well as the non-action of Grover Cleveland. It is sickening and pitiful to think of what is and then of what might have been had we elected a real Democrat in 1892.”

Violent words, these; to many, doubtless inexcusable if not indeed unpardonable. That they were the accurate expression of the speaker's community, however, may not be questioned. That the provocation which evoked their utterance was not small is equally manifest. That they constituted an outburst of honest indignation, whether righteous or not, none will deny. Would Champ Clark recall or conceal the words if it lay within his power to do so? We think not. He might and doubtless does regret both the occasion and the vituperation, but no consideration of expediency could impel contrition for having spoken at a given time, under given conditions, what he then believed to be the truth. Susceptible of explanation or not, the record stands, and he would be the last to blot it out for personal advantage.

Six years passed. Champ Clark was now fifty-four years old. Had experience brought knowledge, wisdom, consideration, recognition of things existing no less than of things desired? We turn to the tariff, or reciprocity, debate of 1904:

MR. OLMSTED. “Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman from Missouri whether he entertains the same views and stands in the same position to-day as regards the tariff that he did in 1897, when the Dingley bill was on its passage?”

MR. CLARK. “Academically, yes. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

Just exactly. Now, sit down till I answer you. [Laughter.] Academically, yes."

MR. DALZELL. "Will the gentleman allow me for a moment?"

MR. CLARK. "Wait until I get through with the other Pennsylvanian. I heard the Hon. Thomas B. Reed state, on the floor of this House, that free trade is a beautiful theory; that it might do for England, but that we had not yet reached that state. Practically, as legislating for the country, with certain laws on the statute-books and certain habits formed, I would not go to a free-trade basis, and before I get through, if I have the time, I will state the Democratic position exactly about cutting down the tariff rates.

MR. DALZELL. "Will the gentleman allow me now?"

MR. CLARK. "Yes."

MR. DALZELL. "I want to know whether the gentleman on March 31, 1897, said on the floor of this House the following:

"I repeat, so that all men may hear, that I am a free-trader, and proudly take my stand with Sir Robert Peel, Richard Cobden, John Bright, and Henry George. I may be an humble member of that illustrious company, but it is better to be a doorkeeper in the house of honest free-traders than to dwell in the tents of wicked protectionists."

MR. CLARK. "Yes."

MR. DALZELL. "That is an accurate quotation?"

MR. CLARK. "I think it is. It sounds like I would have put it." [Laughter.]

MR. DALZELL. "Does the gentleman still keep the same position?"

MR. CLARK. "Theoretically, yes." [Laughter on the Republican side.]

"I will tell you my position about it exactly. If a new continent should be discovered, and I should be given charge of its government after it was populated, I should establish free trade."

MR. LACEY. "And not otherwise?"

MR. CLARK. "Not otherwise? There is no sense in adding those words to it. I have stated the case." [Laughter.]

MR. MCCLEARY, of Minnesota. "Will not the gentleman be good enough to define 'free trade' as he uses that expression now?"

MR. CLARK. "Free interchange of the products of the world."

MR. MCCLEARY, of Minnesota. "Without a tariff on any import?"

MR. CLARK. "In order to raise money to run the Government I would levy a revenue tariff. We are in a situation produced by the practice and theory of over a hundred years. The American people have fallen into the habit of raising a large part of the revenue by tariff taxes, and they seem to think it is easier to do it in that way than in any other. Therefore I would not go to the basis of free trade. I would cut down the exorbitant and outrageous exactions of the Dingley bill."

MR. DALZELL. "But, if the gentleman will allow me, we are in precisely the same condition to-day that we were when he made that declaration, so far as revenue is concerned."

MR. CLARK. "Oh, no, we are not."

MR. DALZELL. "Precisely."

MR. CLARK. "I made that declaration in 1897, and the Treasury was empty. Now the Treasury is overflowing, and if they will pare down

the appropriation bills in this House as they ought to be pared down we could cut off two hundred millions of revenue and never miss it."

MR. WATSON rose.

MR. CLARK. "Wait until I finish with the gentleman from Pittsburg. Because we are in the habit of raising revenue by tariff taxes under both Republican and Democratic administrations, and because the constitutional provision for levying a direct tax is unfair, inasmuch as it makes it in proportion to the number of people in a State instead of in proportion to the property thereof, and inasmuch as the Supreme Court knocked the income tax in the head, to tell you the truth about it, I do not see any other way to raise a sufficient amount of revenue to run the Government except by tariff taxes and the internal-revenue system. That is the whole of it. . . . But in levying a tariff we want reasonable rates, not excessive rates."

Addressing the House for the first time as Speaker on April 4, 1911, Mr. Clark called for:

"1. An honest, intelligent revision of the tariff downward, in order to give every American citizen an equal chance in the race of life, and to pamper none by special favor or special privilege; to reduce the cost of living by eradicating the enormities and cruelties of the present tariff bill, and to raise the necessary revenue to support the Government."

The various bills passed by the House and now pending in the Senate were constructed upon this theory. To what extent Mr. Clark's present attitude is inconsistent with that taken by him fifteen years ago, and to what extent his vision has been broadened naturally by the assumption of actual responsibility, the reader must determine.

Champ Clark declared his position regarding expansion in a debate upon the Cuban reciprocity bill in 1903, when he said:

"I am in favor of this bill because there are two pieces of ground on the North American continent that I want to see annexed to the United States. One is Cuba, and the other is every foot of the British North American possessions, no matter how far north they extend. [Applause.]

"I am not in favor of conquering them. There is no reason why they should be conquered, and if we act with any sense they will come to us peaceably, and this bill is a step in the right direction. If we want the friendship of Cuba, as we are in duty bound to do, and in good sense bound to do, she will come to us in time without the expenditure of a dollar, without the shedding of a single tear."

During the recent Canadian campaign he repeated this declaration, and the anti-Laurier party and the English Tories distorted it into a threat of enforced annexation, to serve their political purposes. The interpretation was

so manifestly unwarranted that the subject is unworthy of consideration.

We have now set forth Speaker Clark's utterances upon important topics which have induced discussion and evoked criticism. As illustrating further the processes of his mind during the past twenty years, no less than as indicating his attitude upon a variety of public questions, we append excerpts from the great number of speeches which he has delivered in the House of Representatives:

"1893.—For political reasons Republicans are very particular to speak of the negro; from force of habit we call him plain 'nigger.' They feed him taffy; we give him the creature comforts of this life. They build for him magnificent 'castles in Spain,' which he can never inhabit; we erect for him unpretentious cabins and bid him be happy with his wife and pickaninnies. [Laughter.] They stuff his head with esthetic philosophy; we furnish school-houses for his children and employ teachers for their education. They give him allopathic doses of sympathy in magazines, newspapers, and public speeches; we minister to his wants in sickness, in distress, and in every time of trouble. They urge him to break into the best society of the South, which he can never do; we give him employment whereby to earn an honest living."

"1893.—I think that the body of men who made the Constitution of the United States formed the most august assembly that ever met beneath the sun. They possessed more wisdom than any other one set of gentlemen that ever undertook to do any one thing. They knew a great deal, but they did not know it all. [Laughter.] They were originators. Of necessity, they were experimenting. They were pioneers in the work of making a paper Constitution. They had no models. They wrought wondrous well. We are largely their debtors. We should never cease to revere their memory. But time is the test of all things, and a century's experience has taught us some things which they did not, which they could not know. Some few, remarkably few, defects have been found in their great work. If they were alive to-day they would be the first to suggest remedies for these defects which no human wisdom could foresee."

"1893.—In the heat of debate we are all liable to make a good many violent statements. I believe this is true about Republicans, and Democrats too—individually, they want to do what is right; that is, the bulk of them. Take the Republicans one at a time, and they are very clever sort of gentlemen [laughter], but take them *en masse*, and they will not do to tie to, by a jugful. [Laughter.] I want to say another thing: We honestly believe, gentlemen, that these laws are dangerous, even to say nothing about their constitutionality. A thing is not good simply because it is constitutional; a great many things might be constitutional and at the same time unnecessary or even dangerous; but I believe they are unconstitutional."

"1894.—I have no prejudice against the people of the District of Columbia. It is a good district and a fine town [laughter], but I hope there will never be such another on the face of the green earth. [Great

laughter and applause.] The fact that no man in the District of Columbia is permitted to vote on any proposition whatever is the saddest commentary that has ever been written or uttered upon the principle of free government."

"1898.—Congress should formulate the Monroe Doctrine as we now understand it, and it should be in words about as follows: 'The American Republic hereby takes all of North America, Central America, South America, and all the islands of the adjacent seas under the shadow of her protecting wing, guarantees to them any form of government they choose, and warns Europe, Asia, and Africa to keep their hands off the Western Hemisphere on the penalty of being thrashed within an inch of their lives.' [Applause.]

"That is the Monroe Doctrine as interpreted by a Missouri Democrat. [Laughter.] We should extend a moral protectorate over them all. Not one of these Central or South American Republics can maintain its independence without our support. They caught the spirit of freedom from us. They copied their form of government from ours. Round about the young and feeble Republics already established in this hemisphere we should throw our friendship and influence, and we should encourage Cuba and all the rest of the West-Indian Islands to unite themselves into a republic of their own. The habit of representative government is healthy and laudable. It should be fostered by us in every way possible. We should not only lend them our moral support, but should give them physical aid in cases of necessity.

"It is high time that we served plain and emphatic notice on all kings, emperors, princes, and potentates that the navies of transatlantic powers shall not be used as collection bureaus for questionable debts, as was done a year or two ago at Corinto, and as was done a month or so ago at Haiti." [Applause.]

"1898.—A Chinaman never can be fit for American citizenship. His color, his diet, his mental conformation, his habits of thought, his methods of conduct, his style of living, his ideas of government, his theory of the domestic relations, his code of morals, his religion, his passiveness in servitude, his ultraconservatism, his manners, his amusements, the very fashion of his dress, are radically un-American. In all these he is thoroughly incorrigible. His ways are not our ways. He is among us, but not of us. . . ."

"1899.—Hawaii is a blind for our eyes, a snare for our feet, a bait for our cupidity, the will-o'-the-wisp which will lead us into the Slough of Despond, the bewitching, scheming, treacherous Delilah destined to shear our Samson of his leonine locks and to deliver him bound hand and foot into the power of the Philistines.

"Nature has set bounds to this magnificent Republic beyond which she should not go—the Atlantic on the east, the Gulf of Mexico and the Rio Grande on the south, the Pacific on the west, and in the fulness of time, without the expenditure of a dollar or the spilling of one drop of blood or the shedding of a single tear, the frozen ocean on the north."

"1899.—I say this, I am not hidebound about politics. There are great and distinguished Republicans. I have great admiration for Abraham Lincoln. I claim a part of the honor of Grant's fame as an American citizen. Garfield was a wonder of learning and brains. The younger Harrison was far above the average President in character and capacity.

I admire McKinley in some respects, but I entertain a supreme contempt, although he is in the grave, for Hayes, because he stole the Presidency of the United States, the greatest crime committed in all the flood of time. I do not care if he is dead. Public men live after they are buried. They live in their records. I wish Hayes had been compelled to live forever and had had to bear the scorn of decent men until the end of the world itself."

"1900.—What difference in principle is there between a few hundred thousand white men buying and owning four million negroes and the Government of the United States buying and owning ten million Malays? If the Filipinos are not to be consulted, what becomes of that clause in the Declaration of Independence which informs us that 'all men are created equal,' and that other which revolutionized half the governments on earth by proclaiming that 'all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed'? Driven from one untenable position, the nimble jingoes immediately assume another. Their last claim is that we should retain the Philippines because the poor, untutored savages are incapable of self-government, and that if left to themselves they would indulge in revolutions and exterminate one another. I humbly submit that it's none of our affair if they do."

"1900.—I am sure that I would not vote to put a tax on knowledge. I sympathize with the poor boy in his aspirations and struggle for information, for I was as poor a boy as ever grew to lusty manhood in the hill country of Kentucky. I am poor yet. My children are poor. I am a lover of books. I cannot remember a day when I was not. I am glad paper-covered books are cheap; also muslin-bound books, cloth-bound books, leather-bound books, morocco-bound books, books in every binding. But, to save me, I do not see any reason why paper-bound books—books, mark you—should go through the mails at one cent per pound, and the same books, printed by the same men, on the same types and presses, should go at eight cents per pound if they happen to be bound in boards, muslin, leather, etc. It seems to me that what is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander; that if one sort of books is sent through the mails at one cent a pound all sorts should be sent at the same rate. We should go the whole hog or none."

"1902.—It is absolutely true that the President of the United States intrinsically and theoretically is no better than any other good citizen of the Republic. It is not so much the individual we are trying to protect as to protect the Government of the United States and the people of the United States not only against anarchy, but against sorrow and agony of spirit, such as pervaded the entire country when President McKinley was killed. According to my judgment, the most valuable part of this bill is the part of it which authorizes the punishment of the villains who go around over the country making public speeches advising the assassination of people because they hold public office."

"1902.—There would be more wisdom and more justice in establishing a universal old-age pension for every citizen of the Republic than there are in the manner in which we are proceeding to create an old-age pension list from the civil departments of the Government.

"The average citizen who is not in the employment of the Government is just as worthy of an old-age pension as is the Government employee,



for the latter receives the higher compensation, while the former does more and harder work."

"1902.—I suggest to every man here, it is not a matter of politics, it is a matter of economy, it is a matter of plain common sense; and every dollar that we expend here in excess of what we ought to spend is practically a robbery of the people. I hear statesmen here talking about the money which belongs to the United States Government. It does not own a single dollar of money anywhere on the face of the earth. It is simply a trustee for the people, and a trustee of an express trust."

"1908.—I will give you a sample of what I consider public honor. John Quincy Adams was one of the most disagreeable personages that ever sat in the White House, but he was thoroughly educated. He had an extremely delicate sense of honor, and I give him that credit and glory. When he was elected to the House after he was President he owned some stock in the old United States Bank, and he went immediately after his election and sold that stock, on the ground that there might be legislation involving the property of the United States Bank in Congress, and I commend his example to all of us. [Applause.]

"While I am talking about John Quincy Adams I will tell you another thing that I commend. He is one of three or four United States Senators that ever had conscience enough, when he was instructed by the legislature of his state to vote in a way that he thought was improper, to resign his office and go home. That is to be commended in him, too."

"1908.—The first time that my wife and I ever attended a White House dinner she was assigned to the Peruvian minister to take her out to dinner. She could not talk any Peruvian [laughter] and he could not talk much English, and though she is a very fine talker the conversation lagged somewhat.

"But, sitting on her right was Mr. Secretary of State John Sherman. She had never been introduced to the Secretary, but she recognized him by his pictures. She had frequently told me privately that she intended that if she ever got close enough to him to ask him about the "Crime of '73." [Laughter.] They scraped up an acquaintance, and Secretary Sherman explained to her how the President and his wife were bedeviled with all sorts of people and how unsanitary the conditions of the house were, and that it wore the President and his wife to a frazzle, and endangered their health—even their lives. After drawing as gloomy a picture as he could, he asked her, 'Madam, would you be willing to see your husband live in this house four years with all that trouble and danger and under those conditions?' With that good sense which she exhibited when she picked her husband she said, 'Yes; I think I would.' [Great laughter.] She said she was willing to take the chances of unsanitary conditions and nervous prostration to see her husband in the White House for four years."

"1910.—I would not give a vote under any consideration whatever that I thought would cripple the United States Government in any of its legitimate functions, for this is as much my government as it is your government, except that you happen to have the offices at the present time and we have not, but that is not the question at issue. It is my government. It is my father's government. It is my children's govern-

ment. A man who would not support it in all of its legitimate functions is not fit for the great honor of American citizenship [applause on the Democratic side], and I always add to the old Democratic dictum, economy in the public expense, that labor may be lightly burdened, this, that every function of the Government should be economically but effectively administered, and enough money should be voted for that purpose. But we should remember that we are trustees of a trust fund, and we have no right to squander the public money. We are not fit to be here if we do. I do not advocate things while we are in the minority which I will be unwilling to advocate when we are a majority. We in Congress cannot reasonably expect others to economize unless we set the example.

"Whenever you have a legitimate appropriation here I will vote for it; whenever you have one—I do not care whether it is big or little—which I do not believe should go into an appropriation bill I will vote to put it out; and you can call that poor leadership if you choose, but I believe the American people will indorse it." [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

"1911.—No man is fit to be the lawgiver for a mighty people who yields to the demands and solicitations of the few who have access to his ear, and is forgetful of the vast multitude who may never hear his voice or look into his face."

"1912.—I repeat that, in my judgment, the tariff and the cognate question of the trusts will constitute the overshadowing issues in the coming campaign. The Republicans will undoubtedly undertake to befog these issues and lure us away from the tariff question and the trust question, because they realize the fact that on the tariff question and the trust question we will defeat them most decisively. Of course, there are subsidiary questions of more or less importance, some of them of great importance, but the battle for tariff reform and the destruction of the trusts must be fought to a finish. On these questions we are undoubtedly in the right. We have justice on our side, and on them we should win a sweeping triumph.

"‘By their fruits ye shall know them,’ is a rule established by highest authority. It is grounded in wisdom and in justice. By that rule we are ready to be judged.

"In his speech nominating General Grant for a third term Roscoe Conkling said, ‘General Grant’s fame rests not only on things spoken and things written, but upon the arduous greatness of things done.’ That sentence fits the Democrats of Congress like a glove.

"The Republicans seem to be utterly demoralized. That their quarrels, unless composed, will help us there can be no doubt. But our chief reliance for success is to give to the people such a record for honest, intelligent, courageous, constructive, progressive statesmanship as to convince the country beyond the shadow of a doubt that we are worthy of the continued and enlarged confidence of the public. To do this we must lead in the enactment of all remedial legislation. That is our duty to our country and our kind.

"That is the straightest, plainest, shortest, and easiest road to complete success. Pursuing that line of conduct, victory will perch upon our banners whether the Republicans patch up their differences or not. We

hold our own fate absolutely in our own hands. Let us not lose our golden opportunity through overconfidence or upon ill-advised reliance upon the quarrels and factional fights among our opponents."

"1912.—Can business men trust the Democratic party? is what the lawyers would call a leading question propounded to me. It is a thing incredible that any sane man or set of sane men would desire to injure any legitimate business. The Democrats constitute one-half of the American people. They are engaged in every species of legitimate business known among men and possible in this country. The effect of law falls like the rain, the sunshine, and the dew of Heaven equally on the just and unjust. Consequently the Democrats cannot injure other people's business without injuring their own. I have said before, and I say now, that no legitimate industry in the United States has any cause whatever to fear the action of the Democrats. The desire of Democrats is to so arrange things, as far as may be, that every American citizen shall have an equal chance in the race of life.

"That is what we promised to do, and that is what we are going to do so far as is possible."

This article is purely expository. It is no part of our purpose to attack, excuse, or defend. Certain deductions, however, may be made. Champ Clark sprang from that hardy stock which produced the American pioneers, virile, intense, honest, patriotic, headstrong. The red blood coursed swiftly through his veins till the mellowing influence of time checked its speed. Responsibility begat reflection and calm, tolerance of the opinions of others, evenness of disposition, moderation in thought, word, and deed. That he achieved his present eminence unaided is no more significant than the use to which he put his power. It is a simple fact, surely worthy of consideration, that never before has the business of the House of Representatives been conducted with more decorum, greater dignity, or truer efficiency than under his guidance as Speaker. That much of his success is attributable to exceptional popularity achieved by a winning personality is plainly evident. But it is no less obvious that underneath are qualities of native ability, of rugged common sense, of undoubted integrity, of intense patriotism, of sympathy with humankind, which constitute character. That his strength should be greater in the West, where he is known, than in the East, where he is comparatively a stranger, is a fact neither discreditable nor uncommon. A like condition existed half a century ago when another son of the plain people, also Kentucky born, was under the scrutiny of those who beheld him from afar. How like the comments of metropolitan

journals now are those of the great newspapers then! Turn back the files and read:

From the New York *Herald*:

"*May 19, 1860.*—The Republican Convention at Chicago have nominated Abraham Lincoln, of Illinois, for President of the United States—a third-rate Western lawyer, poorer than even poor Pierce. . . . The conduct of the Republican party in this nomination is a remarkable indication of a small intellect, growing smaller. They pass over Seward, Chase, and Banks, who are statesmen and able men, and they take a fourth-rate lecturer, who cannot speak good grammar, and who, to raise the wind, delivers his hackneyed, illiterate compositions at two hundred dollars apiece. Our readers will recollect that this peripatetic politician visited New York two or three months ago on his financial tour, when, in return for the most unmitigated trash, interlarded with coarse and clumsy jokes, he filled his empty pockets with dollars coined out of Republican fanaticism."

"*May 20th.*—The rejection of Seward and the nomination of Lincoln, who represents all that is brutal and bloody in Seward's political programme, without possessing a tithe of his personal ability, is almost as severe a blow at the Republican party organization as was the feud at Charleston to that of the Democracy. . . . The highest claims for the candidate who is put up as a fit ruler for thirty millions of freemen, pursuing a march of social development with a rapidity that is the wonder of the age, is that he can 'maul rails,' and that he is 'honest.' What part the first of these qualities is to play in the science of government we cannot conceive; the second we know to be the quality that commends him to demagogues and robbers that now swarm about the public offices, for it makes them more secure of their prey."

"*May 21st.*—Lincoln is the echo of Seward without his practical acumen, the follower of Spooner with the rabid spirit of Helper, and the worshipper of John Brown without his pluck. Animated by the same sentiments, but with a far different spirit from that which sent Brown across the Susquehanna, he voluntarily proclaimed in one of his speeches that he 'did mean to go on to the banks of the Ohio and throw missiles into Kentucky to disturb them in their institutions.' Such is the man whom the fanatical black Republicans have brought forward as their choice for President of the American confederation, and for whom they have rejected every man with conservative tendencies, practical statesmanship, or national views, to be found within the party ranks."

"*May 22d.*—The candidate for President, Abram Lincoln, is an uneducated man—a vulgar village politician, without any experience worth mentioning in the practical duties of statesmanship, and only noted for some very unpopular votes which he gave while a member of Congress."

"As to the reception of this miraculous mouse which the Chicago mountain has brought forth, nothing can be more discouraging."

"*May 23d.*—Lincoln is exactly of the same type as the traitor who was hung at Charleston—an abolitionist of the reddest dye, liable to be led to extreme lengths by other men. Without education or refinement, he will be the plaything of his party, whirled along in the vortex of

passion if he should gain the control of the Government. The comparison between Seward and this illiterate Western boor is odious—it is as Hyperion to a satyr. Lincoln has in an aggravated and virulent degree all that rendered Seward unpopular with the conservative classes, while he has none of those redeeming qualities and gifts of genius which distinguish the son of New York.”

*From the Albany Atlas and Argus:*

“*May 21st.*—Mr. Lincoln was first heard of in politics a year ago last fall, when, limping with wounds and howling with anguish, he was driven through the State of Illinois by Douglas, and defeated with the tacit approval of the majority of his own party, and with the publicly expressed gratulations of Greeley, Weed, and others. Last spring he made his *début* in this State as an orator, and commenced by charging for his speeches at the rate of one hundred dollars apiece, and was forced to desist amid such public expressions of contempt that he may be said to have been fairly hissed out of the State. He has never held public office of any credit, and is not known except as a slang-whanging stump speaker, of a class with which every party teems, and of which all parties are ashamed.”

*From the Boston Post:*

“*May 21st.*—Lincoln has merely talent for demagogue appeal, that was thought to be worth in New England fifty or one hundred dollars a speech, by those who hired him; but some who heard him were surprised that he should be considered anywhere a great man. He can only be the tool of the fanatical host he will lead on. This is the truth of the case, let the blowers of his party swell him as they may into tremendous dimensions. By this means, and by imitating in every locality the trickery and demagogism that won Lincoln his local popularity, and at length the nomination, his partisans may attempt to secure his election. But such is the intelligence of the country that his attempt must fail.”

*From the Philadelphia Evening Journal:*

“*May 24th.*—*Why should Lincoln be President?* There is not in all the history of his life any exhibition of intellectual ability and attainments fitting him for the high and responsible post in the Government for which he has been nominated. When in Congress, from 1847 to 1849, he was not only not distinguished by any display of parliamentary talent, or by any special service, but those who sat in the same Congress find it difficult to remember that any such person as Abraham Lincoln occupied a seat on the floor. His contest in 1858 with Mr. Douglas for the election as United States Senator from Illinois is the beginning of his fame, and while he showed in that controversy the rough strength of a practised stump speaker, and the pluck of a champion who enters the ring with a crowd of sturdy backers, he exceeded even Seward in the extravagance of his views respecting the slavery question, while his coarse language, his illiterate style, and his vulgar and vituperative personalities in debate contrast very strongly with the elegant and classical oratory of the eminent Senator from New York”

From the *Boston Courier*:

*"July 17th.—A New Argument for the Rail-splitter.* The most careful readers of the Scriptures have sometimes remarked that no matter how carefully or how frequently they have studied the Bible, they are sure to find something new—that is, new to them, of course, because the thought was there from the beginning, and their minds only became prepared to discover it. The lesson is constantly enforced in this way, that man is very much the same as formerly, and that the same things happen to the race now as in former times. But we were scarcely prepared to find so close a description of the Republican candidate to distinction as we see in Psalm 74, v. 5: 'A man famous, according as he had lifted up axes upon thick trees.'"

The parallel is obvious. Morally, we believe it can be said with truth derived from impartial investigation, Champ Clark is the peer of Abraham Lincoln. Of his relative intellectual qualifications for the greatest political position in the world the reader shall be the judge. Our duty ends in setting forth the bases upon which opinion may be formed.

---

### OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD

OSCAR W. UNDERWOOD personifies the new, progressive, prosperous, business-like South. Born in Kentucky, in 1862, of well-to-do parents and distinguished lineage, graduated from Rugby School, Kentucky, and the University of Virginia, he began to practise law in Birmingham, Alabama, in 1884 and was first elected to Congress in 1894. His advancement followed as a natural consequence of constant application of his exceptional talents until he achieved the position of definite leadership at the beginning of the present Congress. His record in this highly responsible capacity, with respect to intelligence, tactfulness, and courage manifested or to results accomplished under difficult conditions, has never been surpassed.

Mr. Underwood owes no small part of his prominence as a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President to the dictatorial propensities of William Jennings Bryan. While the tariff bills were under discussion Mr. Bryan publicly attacked the Democratic leader as a betrayer of the principles of his party. On the following day Mr. Underwood made the rejoinder which instantly won for him respect and fame throughout the country. The scene in the House of Representatives was admirably depicted by Mr. Samuel G. Blythe:

"The gentleman from Alabama is recognized," said the Speaker, leaning forward.

"Mr. Speaker," began Underwood, calmly, evenly, dispassionately, and coolly—"Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege."

"He asked that the clerk read from the newspaper which he held in his hand. It was a telegraphic despatch from Lincoln, Nebraska, and it began: 'The recent activity of Representative Underwood in defeating the attempt by Champ Clark and others to reduce the steel-and-iron schedule has met with the disapproval of W. J. Bryan.'"

"The reading clerk paused here, then began again: 'To-day Bryan authorizes the following statement: "The action of Chairman Underwood in opposing an immediate effort to reduce the iron and steel schedule reveals the real Underwood. Speaker Clark and other tariff-reformers tried to secure the passage of a resolution instructing the Ways and Means Committee to take up other schedules, including the iron and steel schedule; but Underwood and Fitzgerald, of New York, succeeded in defeating the resolution."'"

"There was more of the statement, but that is enough to show its general tenor. It charged Underwood with being tainted with protection and having an individual interest in the iron and steel business, and was a very pointed and personal assault. After the clerk had finished reading the statement there was a moment of silence. Underwood stood looking directly at the Speaker, who still half leaned across the big desk up under the flag. Then Underwood began speaking, slowly, dispassionately, evenly, and gravely.

"The statements contained in that article are absolutely false!" he said. Instantly the entire Democratic side broke into a roar of applause.

"If the reflections that paper contains rested only on myself I should not take the time of this House to answer them; but the statements contained in that article are a reflection on the only body of Democracy that is in control of this Government, and as the representative leader on the floor of this House, of this majority, I should be untrue to my party if I did not rise here and stamp those utterances with the brand of falsehood!"

"Underwood continued. He asserted he had asked the committee to take up the iron and steel schedule first because he comes from an iron and steel district, and appealed to his Democratic colleagues on the committee to support this statement, which they did. He said the committee had deemed it wiser to take up the woolen and the cotton schedules first because the iron and steel schedules had been cut in the Wilson, the Dingley, and the Payne bills—and wool and cotton had not been revised for many years. Mr. Kitchin, of North Carolina, corroborated what Underwood claimed; and Underwood further proved his case, explaining his connection with the iron and steel business—he is a stockholder in a company that makes pig iron—and having a telegram read from Mr. Bryan, dated April 23d, to Ollie James, in which Mr. Bryan asked James to convey his congratulations to Underwood.

"Mr. Speaker," said Underwood, "Mr. Bryan did not say I was protectionizing the Democratic party when I brought in the free-list bill. Not until I differed with him on the woolen schedule did he have one word of criticism so far as my conduct was concerned. . . . I had to write

a woolen schedule that would protect the revenues of this Government, and because I did so and did not obey the command of the gentleman from Nebraska, Mr. Bryan, he is endeavoring to make the country believe I am not an honest Democrat in favor of an honest revenue tariff.'

"There was some more of the speech, but not much. It was delivered earnestly, but without heat and without an attempt at oratorical flourish. There was no frenzy of denial, no protesting of innocence, no beating about the bush. A sane young man made a sane denial—and proved his case. That was all there was to it—except this:

"When Underwood finished that statement and sat down, amid the applause of the House, the State of Alabama had a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President. Underwood didn't know it; nor was it the fact that he had assailed Mr. Bryan that made him a candidate. What gave the State of Alabama a Presidential candidate was this: Here was a man with the highest type of political courage—independence. Here was a man who did not attempt to palter with a situation, and a delicate one politically, but met it calmly and proved his contention. Here was a man who, as floor-leader of the House majority, was endeavoring to do what seemed best for the Democratic party and the country, and not for the benefit of any individual or the theories of any individual; and the country applauded."

Thus was the character of Oscar W. Underwood revealed to his countrymen. He had demonstrated his sagacity and effectiveness; here was a manifestation of sincerity and courage such as is seldom seen in public life. From that moment the leader of the House became and is to-day the distinctive embodiment of the chief issue of the Democratic party in its appeal to the country for restoration of full power. Mr. Underwood has defined that issue in these simple words:

"The true distinction between the two great parties of this country, to my mind, is the difference between a prohibitive tariff bill and a competitive tariff bill. The Republican party favors a tariff that will raise some revenue to support the Government, but at the same time will prohibit as much foreign merchandise as possible from coming into the country to raise revenue at all. Though the Republican party has repeatedly declared it favors a tariff to protect the difference in cost of production at home and abroad, in fact it favors a protection of the manufacturers' profits; and the Republican party has continually fixed the rates levied at the custom-house so greatly in excess of the difference in cost of production at home and abroad that in many cases the rate has become prohibitive, and no importation was allowed to enter at all. The Democratic party has always declared for a tariff for revenue only.

"It is true that any tariff taxes that are levied which allow some imports to enter the country would, in one sense, be a tariff for revenue; but I take it that the clear meaning of the declaration of the party in favor of a tariff for revenue means a competitive tariff—that is, a tariff



that allows sufficient imports from abroad to bring about fair and honest competition, hereby producing revenue and at the same time preventing the home producer from hiding behind a tariff wall that will enable him to establish monopolies and unduly increase the burdens of taxation resting upon the American people, without their receiving any benefit in return, either in the shape of revenue for the Government or in the development of the great industries of the country.

"It is an axiom which cannot be disputed that the moment any industry is allowed to create a monopoly its development along lines of best endeavor at once ceases. If there was a more general understanding that the tariff is a tax, in which private interests share the proceeds with the Government, there would be a more vigorous questioning of the various duties imposed by Congress than has yet been manifested. Protection is granted for the purpose of enabling new industries to establish themselves and to offset the difference in cost at home and abroad. If an industry cannot be strong and lusty in a reasonable time it shows it is developed by artificial means and is not justified—and the props should be taken away. Statistics conclusively show that most of our industries are able to stand alone. Our natural advantages, improved machinery, efficiency of American labor, and ocean freight rates in many instances overcome the differences in cost of labor at home and abroad.

"I recognize that false standards have been ingrafted on our industrial life, and that we cannot strike them all off in an hour or a day without serious danger. What I contend is that we turn our faces away from them and gradually and carefully adjust our laws to meet new conditions, without serious injury to either labor or capital, in order that we may reduce the cost of living at home and be prepared to dispose of more of our surplus products in the markets of the world, to the end that we may give constant employment to labor and maintain stable prices at home.

"The Democratic party does not intend to abandon the custom-houses, but favors a policy of levying customs duties for revenue purposes only, at rates that will not destroy fair and honest competition in the home market. This position will be accomplished by the reduction of tariff taxes provided for in the laws now on the statute-books, to a point where fair competition will bring about reasonable prices and destroy monopolistic tendencies caused by the high duties now levied at the custom-houses."

In the course of his long experience in Congress, Mr. Underwood has discussed all vital public questions. His position has been invariably that of his party. More need not be said. If Underwood has been in the wrong it follows irresistibly that the fundamental principles of Democracy are unsound. It suffices then, for the present purpose, to set forth the one great issue which is more distinctively his issue than that of any other Democrat. This has been done in his own words spoken with the calmness, moderation, and lucidity which characterize his every utterance. His claim to political preferment rests upon exceptional

ability, sound judgment, perfect poise, faithful service, and noteworthy achievement.

As between Champ Clark, Speaker, and Oscar W. Underwood, leader of the House, choice must be made by the representatives of their party in convention assembled. Conditions which then will have been created in the turbulent ranks of the opposition will be necessarily a large, if not indeed, a determining factor. Happily the integrity, the patriotism, and the Democracy of both are beyond the possibility of question. No Democrat could find excuse for refusing to vote for either. Whichever may be selected, no heartburn will aggravate the other. We record an episode which, though slight in itself, is indicative of personal traits.

When a certain maker of mischief decided to reverse the action of the Democratic caucus with respect to the woolen schedule he made a personal demand upon Speaker Clark that he lead the revolt. The Speaker courteously declined to interfere. But the disturber was persistent. Returning on the following day, he said in words such as these:

"I can now give you the reason why Underwood's programme must be broken."

The Speaker looked up inquiringly. The visitor continued:

"Do you know whom Underwood is for for President?"

"Why, no," said Mr. Clark, quietly; "I have no idea. We have been so busy trying to adjust differences among the members and to get the House into effective working order that we have discussed nothing else. No, the question of the Presidency has never arisen between us."

"Well, I can tell you," was the sharp and significant rejoinder, "he is for Harmon."

The Speaker looked at his interlocutor meditatively and then spoke with homely simplicity:

"Well, Harmon is a good man."

Then turning and gazing through the window-pane, he added, thoughtfully:

"If he wasn't, Underwood wouldn't be for him."

The conversation ended, but three tributes paid in a single sentence live—one to the distinguished Governor of Ohio, another to the capable leader of the House, and a third, unconscious but unmistakable, to the perfect simplicity, absolute honesty, and true magnanimity of the Speaker himself.

THE EDITOR.